

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application, as amended herein, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 9 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended. Applicant gratefully acknowledges that claims 5 - 7 have been indicated as being allowed.

In item 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1, 2 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA") in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,506,747 to Bain (listed as Babin, in the Office Action) ("BAIN") and U. S. Patent No. 5,841,722 to Willenz ("WILLENZ").

In item 4 of the Office Action, claims 3, 4 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over the AAPA in view of BAIN, WILLENZ and U. S. Patent No. 5,673,416 to Chee ("CHEE").

Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections, as applied to the amended claims.

In item 6 of the Office Action, it was sated that:

With respect to claim 5, the claim limitations are deemed allowable over the prior art of record as the

Applic. No. 09/398,689

Response Dated August 12, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of April 14, 2005

prior art fails to teach or suggest that said second register has a content selectively modifiable with each read cycle of said microprocessor.

Applicant's independent claims 1 and 3 have now been amended to additionally recite the feature indicated as allowable from claim 5. More particularly, claims 1 and 3 have been amended to recite, among other limitations:

storing in a register, for a following writing procedure, a present size of memory, the register having a content selectively modifiable with each read cycle of the microprocessor; [emphasis added by Applicant]

As such, it is believed that all of Applicant's claims now contain the feature indicated as being allowable in the Office Action. As the feature has already been searched in connection with allowed claim 5, it is believed that no new issues are raised by way of this amendment, and that no new search is needed. As such, it is believed that all of Applicant's claims are now in condition for immediate allowance.

It is accordingly believed that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 3 and 5. Claims 1, 3 and 5 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The

Applic. No. 09/398,689

Response Dated August 12, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of April 14, 2005

dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claims 1, 3 or 5.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 - 9 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out. In the alternative, the entry of the amendment is requested, as it is believed to place the application in better condition for appeal, without requiring extension of the field of search.

Additionally, please consider the present as a petition for a one (1) month extension of time, and please provide a one (1) month extension of time, to and including, August 15, 2005, to respond to the present Office Action.

The extension fee for response within a period of one (1) month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$120.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please provide any additional extensions of time that may be necessary and charge any other fees that might be due with

Applic. No. 09/398,689

Response Dated August 12, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of April 14, 2005

respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant

Kerry P. Sisselman

Reg. No. 37,237

August 12, 2005

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.

Post Office Box 2480

Hollywood, FL 33022-2480

Tel: (954) 925-1100

Fax: (954) 925-1101